

In the Claims:

Please amend Claims 5 and 6 to read as follows:

Sub B1
AT

5. (Amended) The aqueous dispersion of claim 1 wherein the ethylene-methacrylic acid copolymer comprises 5-50 wt% of the dispersion and has a melt flow rate of 50-2000 grams/10 minutes at 190°C/2160 gram load.

6. (Amended) The aqueous dispersion of claim 3 wherein the ethylene-methacrylic acid copolymer comprises 5-50 wt% of the dispersion and has a melt flow rate of 50-2000 grams/10 minutes at 190°C/2160 gram load.

REMARKS

The amendments to Claims 5 and 6 are in response to certain §112 deficiencies and not in response to the prior art of record. Basis for the amendments can be found in the wording of respective claims and the specification as originally filed. As such, the amendments do not represent new matter.

At present, Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a patent issued to Best (GB 2 269 822) in view of a patent issued to Nothnagel (U.S. 5,319,019). Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

In asserting the above rejection the Office Action states, in part, that the Best reference discloses the instantly claimed dispersion, except for applicant's instantly claimed excess of ammonia and the instantly claimed melt flow rate. The examiner then argues that applicant's claimed melt flow rate is implicit in Best's disclosed small particle size. The Examiner's attention is directed to the examples on page 5 of Best where the melt index numerically is disclosed consistent with the particle size argument. As such, the novelty of the instantly